THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE T. MEENA KUMARI

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K.C. BHANU

WRIT PETITION No. 5628 of 2006

Between:

C. Abubekar …Petitioner.

And

The Circle Inspector of Police, Puttaparthi Urban,

Puttaparthi, Ananthapur District and others.

…Respondents.

DATE: 29-03-2006

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE T. MEENA KUMARI

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K.C. BHANU

WRIT PETITION No. 5628 of 2006

JUDGMENT (Per the Hon'ble Smt. Justice T. Meena Kumari):

This is a taken up writ petition on the basis of letter dated 6.3.2006

addressed by Sri C. Abubekaar of Anumapalli village, Anantapur District stating that in the past the Puttaparthi Urban Police have implicated his unsound minor son by name C. Baba Fakruddin in a cycle theft case and the Juvenile Court, Guntakal has dismissed the case, but his son has not returned home. It is further alleged that now the Circle Inspector of Puttaparthi Urban is harassing the petitioner to produce the petitioner's son before him and that the police are demanding fingerprints of his son, white papers and Rs.50/- for releasing him and his son. It is also alleged that the police have illegally detained him for two days i.e. on 4th and 5th of March, 2006 and tortured. The petitioner therefore requests to provide protection from the said Circle Inspector of Police, Urban, Puttaparthi.

The 1st respondent – Circle Inspector of Police, Puttaparthi Urban filed counter in the matter stating that the petitioner never lodged any complaint in any of the Police Stations with regard to missing of his son and that the allegation of the petitioner that he was illegally detaining the son of the petitioner and torturing him for two days i.e. on 4th and 5th March, 2006 is false and denied. When there is no case registered or pending against the son of the petitioner, calling him and detaining him does not arise. The allegation of the petitioner that he was demanding the finger prints of his son and took his signature on white papers and also took an amount of Rs.50/- as bribe for releasing him and his son is absolutely false and invented for the purpose of sending the letter to this Court.

In view of the categorical averments made by the 1st respondent stating that the petitioner never lodged any complaint in any of the Police Stations with regard to missing of his son, that the son of the petitioner has been neither detained nor tortured as alleged and that calling or detaining him does not arise for no case is registered or pending against the son of the petitioner, nothing survives in this writ petition for adjudication.

In the result, the writ petition is dismissed.

T. MEENA KUMARI, J.

K.C. BHANU, J.

March 29, 2006.

MVB.